



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,302	10/11/2001	John David Laughlin	10007788-1	1847

7590 12/07/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,302

Applicant(s)

LAUGHLIN, JOHN DAVID

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed 10/11/2001.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Naik et al. (hereinafter “Naik”), US 5,579,446 patented 11/26/1996.

Regarding independent claim 1, Naik discloses an interface configured to receive print job data in fig. 1. Naik discloses a print job formatting routine which notes one or more regions within a print job derived from the print job data and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is then printed in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Naik discloses a WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of the print job in fig. 2A and a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display in fig. 2A and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Naik discloses an input routine configured to receive user input specifying a particular print quality level for each of the one or more regions defined

within the print job in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Naik discloses receiving user input through a mouse connected to a host computer on which the printer driver is running in fig. 1.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Naik discloses wherein the user input routine is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input routine to define the one or more regions within the print job in fig. 2A.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Naik discloses a graphics identification routine for identifying regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Naik discloses an embodiment wherein the print job formatting routine is configured to automatically specify a print quality setting for identified regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Naik discloses a user routine through which a user can specify a default print quality setting to be applied to the identified regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Regarding independent claim 9, Naik discloses printing designated regions within a print job at different print quality levels fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Naik discloses wherein the designated regions are within a single page of the print job in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Naik discloses displaying a WYSIWYG display of the print job in fig. 2A and receiving user input defining one or more of the regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display in fig. 2A and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Naik discloses specifying one or more regions within the print job by moving a cursor driven by a mouse over the WYSIWYG display in fig. 2A.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Naik discloses automatically identifying regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Naik discloses automatically specifying a print quality level for the identified regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Regarding independent claim 15, Naik discloses a host computer and an interface on the host computer for connecting a printing device to the host computer in fig. 1. Naik discloses a printer driver stored on the host computer for formatting print job data from the host computer to a printing device in fig. 1. Naik discloses wherein the printer driver comprises a print job formatting routine which notes one or more regions within a print job derived from print job data and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is to be printed in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Naik discloses a printing device connected to the host computer through the interface in fig. 1. Naik discloses wherein the printing device prints different regions of a print job in accordance with instructions from the print job formatting routine in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Naik discloses wherein the regions printed at different print quality levels are on a single page of the print job in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Naik discloses a WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of a print job in fig. 2A and a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within a print job using the WYSIWYG display in fig. 2A and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Naik discloses wherein the user input routine is configured to receive user input specifying a particular print quality level for each of the one or more regions defined within the print job in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Naik discloses wherein the printer driver further comprises a graphics identification routine for identifying regions of the print job that contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Naik discloses wherein the print job formatting routine automatically specifies a print quality setting for the identified regions of the print job that

Art Unit: 2176

contain a graphic element in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Murphy et al., US 6,661,531 B1 filed 11/15/2000 discloses adaptively matching print quality and performance. Torpey et al., US 6,753,976 B1 filed 12/3/1999 discloses differentially processing image types within a document image to enhance the quality of an image on the receiving medium. Wang, US 5,859,955 patented 1/12/1999 discloses halftoning a digitized image. Revankar et al., US 5,767,978 patented 6/16/1998 discloses an adaptable image segmentation system. Smith et al., US 5,704,021 patented 12/30/1997 discloses identifying one or more different types of color objects in a document and selecting a preferred rendering option for each one.


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
November 8, 2004


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER